REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated March 28, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments. Furthermore, we enclose a Terminal Disclaimer linking the term and ownership of any patent granted on the present application to that of co-pending USSN 10/773,183.

Amendments

The Applicant has updated Page 1 of the specification with an amended paragraph pertaining to cross references to related applications. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter.

The Abstract has been amended to remove 'claim-like' language such as 'comprising'. Accordingly the amendments do not add new matter.

Abstract

As discussed above, we believe that the amended Abstract provides a clear and concise description of the disclosure in compliance with 37 CFR 1.72.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-54 stand provisionally rejected as not patentably distinct from claims 1-54 of co-pending USSN 10/773,183. We trust the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer to '183 addresses this issue.

Claims – 35USC§103

Claims 1 and 19 inter alia stand rejected as obvious in light of US 4,797,692 to Ims in light of US 6,447,104 to Keil et al. The Applicant disagrees.

The Keil printhead collapses the bubbles generated by the heater against the walls of the bubble forming chamber. As shown in Fig. 4, the vapor bubble 55 nucleates and grows over the centre of the heater transducer 34. Then as it collapses, the ink inflow 50 pushes the bubble against the back wall 60 of the chamber and splits it into two smaller bubbles 55A and 55B. These bubbles 55A and 55B lodge in the pockets 66 where they finally collapse (see col.5, ll. 30-35 and col. 6, ll. 5-6).

While the pockets 66 are spaced from the heat transducer 34, the chamber sidewalls will still experience cavitation corrosion from collapsing bubbles. In contrast, the present invention configures the heater and the chamber such that the bubble collapses at a void. This prevents any cavitation corrosion.

Accordingly, Ims and Keil do not anticipate all the element of claims 1 and 19 and so do not support a §103 rejection.

Claims 2-18 and 20-54 stand rejected as obvious in light of Ims and Keil in view of additional references cited against certain of the claims. As discussed above, Ims and Keil do not disclose the combination of features defined by independent claims 1 or 19. Likewise, Ims and Keil fail to anticipate amended independent claim 38. The additional references cited also fail to disclose

all the elements of the independent claims and accordingly, fail to support a §103 rejection. It follows that all the dependent claims are likewise novel and non-obvious.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicants:

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762